



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,996	09/19/2005	Joji Fujiwara	MAT-8744US	1009
52473	7590	11/19/2008	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA P.O. BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482				CRAWFORD, LATANYA N
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2813				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/19/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/549,996	FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	LATANYA CRAWFORD	2813	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) LaTanya Crawford (USPTO). (3) Jacques Etkowicz.  
 (2) Thao Le (SPE). (4) Dennis DeFino.

Date of Interview: 17 November 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tsuneoka (US Pub no. 2004/0252475 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner withdraws the objection to the specification. The Examiner agrees with applicants arguments in regards to claim 1 and further notes that the limitations of claim 1 overcome the prior art of Tsuneoka et al. The rejection made (using Tsuneoka) to claim 17 is maintained. A suggestion to add "a partition made of a composition of a resin and an electrically conductive material" overcomes the rejection of Tsuneoka.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Thao X Le/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2892
--	---